

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 stand are pending and at issue.

Claim 8 has been amended to overcome the rejection under §112 as suggested in the rejection. According, it is believed the rejection should now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 8 as anticipated by Larson et al US 2004/0056089 is respectfully traversed. The rejection is based upon a misunderstanding of the claims and/or a mischaracterization of Larson et al.

Independent claim 1 recites the steps of entering a photograph image of each authorized person into a database which is maintained in a portable or hand-held computer; reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by a person seeking entry; and the portable or hand-held computer comparing the sent data to the database and displaying the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data, via the display. Independent method claim 2 recites the steps of entering a photograph image of each person of a larger population into a database, which is maintained in a portable or hand-held computer; reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by a person seeking entry; and the portable or hand-held computer comparing the sent data to the database and displaying the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data, via the display. Dependent claims 5 and 6 are directed towards a system and recite a portable or hand-held computer having a display and maintaining a database, into which has been entered a photograph image of each person to whom one of has been issued, means including an electronic reader for reading the data displayed or recorded by each token presented by

a person seeking entry and for sending the read data to the portable or hand-held computer; and wherein the portable or hand-held computer is programmed to compare the sent data to the database and to display, via the display, the photographic image entered on the database of the person identified by the sent data. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, these steps and structure are neither shown nor suggested by Larson et al. More specifically, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, the step of entering a photographic image of each authorized person into a database which is maintained in a portable computer or hand-held computer is neither shown nor suggested in Larson et al, let alone shown or suggested in paragraphs 0031 and 0027 of Larson et al. Rather, paragraph 0031 is directed to the production of "a security card, badge or tag" for each approved vendor employee, and paragraph 0027 is discussing individual sponsor entities 70, rather than the portable handheld device reader 30 described in paragraph 0019. While Larson et al does disclose the idea of entering information about authorized persons into a database, it doesn't in any way disclose or suggest that the database should be maintained in the handheld device 30 described in paragraph 0019 of Larson et al. Furthermore, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Larson et al does not disclose that the portable or handheld computer 30 actually compares the sent data read from its identifier devices to a database containing information of each authorized person, let alone to such a database that is maintained in its portable or handheld device 30. In this regard, paragraph 0072 is limited to discussing how a portable device 30 having a portable radio frequency identifier device could be used to perform the card reading functions described in paragraphs 0069, 0070 and 0071. Furthermore, it is noted that there is

nothing in paragraphs 0069-0072 stating where the step of comparing the sent data to the database is performed, let alone that it could be performed in the handheld reader device 30. Additionally, while paragraph 0075 mentions distributed devices and databases at the sponsor locations, it does not state or even imply that the databases could be maintained in handheld device 30, let alone that read and sent data could be compared to a database that is maintained in a handheld device 30. Paragraph 0076 of Larson et al adds nothing in this regard. For each of the above reasons alone, the §102 rejection of the claims is improper and should be withdrawn.


It follows from the above, that Larson et al also fails to disclose a plurality of portable or handheld computers, each of which maintains a replica of the database, as recited in claim 8. For this additional reason, the rejection of claim 8, dependent from claims 5 or 6, is improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims and allowance of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By


Jeffrey N. Fairchild
Reg. No. 37,825

February 11, 2008

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661-2562
(312) 876-1800